

REMARKS

The Examiner has restricted claims in this case to three distinct inventions designated as Species I, claims 1-35, drawn to Figure 2; Species II, claims 36-51, drawn to Figure 4; and Species III, claims 52-54, drawn to Figure 3. To the extent that Applicants understand the Examiner's designation of the three species, Applicants contest such designation.

All of the claims of the present application are directed to storing data in a database. Each independent claim sets forth additional limitations as is typical for independent claims within an application. However, the scope of the claims is directed towards the same end (storing data in a database).

At the very least, the Examiner's explanation for why the species are patentably distinct does not provide the Applicants with the ability to rebut such designation. Examiner does not designate separate classes required to be searched for the separate species or provide an explanation as to why the claims in the three species cannot be commonly searched. In addition, having separate embodiments of a single invention in separate figures (the Examiner's only stated basis for restricting allegedly patentably distinct species) is a common practice for patent applications, in which a plurality of figures are commonly submitted.


For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the search classification for each group will substantially overlap. The Examiner will not be seriously burdened by searching and considering the inventions described in the restricted claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement and requests reconsideration. In order to be fully responsive, Applicants have provisionally elected, with traverse, the invention of Species I drawn to claims 1-35. By this election, Applicants do not admit, nor do Applicants waive the right to argue against at a later date, the Examiner's statement that the groups of inventions are patentably distinct. Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the claims of Species II (claims 36-51), Species III (claims 52-54) or other claims, in one or more divisional, continuation or continuation-in-part applications at a later date, if necessary.

AUTHORIZATION

Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a proper restriction requirement under MPEP §803, and it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, and that the application is now in condition for examination and allowance on the merits. Notice to such effect is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment and Response, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account no. 05-0436.

Respectfully submitted,
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP


Joseph T. Helmsen
Reg. No. 54,163

Pepper Hamilton LLP
One Mellon Center, 50th Floor
500 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: 412.454.5000
Facsimile: 412.281.0717
Date: July 13, 2007